REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim 7 is amended. Claims 1-6, 11-15, 18-21, 28-37 and 45-48 were previously canceled. Claims 7-10, 16, 17, 22-27, and 38-44 are pending in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

Claim 16 was rejected as being obvious over Larson (US 2003/0033464) in view of Brunner (US 2003/0213868). Claim 17 was rejected as being obvious over Larson and Brunner as applied to claim 16, and further in view of Mihm (US 2005/0229173). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 16 requires, inter alia, "a real time operating system (RTOS) management module having multiple specific mapping functions for communicating with different types of RTOS, allowing the advanced IPMI system to function with different RTOS." As explained in the previous Amendment in connection with claim 27, an RTOS is different from a general operating system of a processor. As is commonly understood, "A Real-Time Operating System (RTOS; generally pronounced as "R-toss") is a multitasking operating system intended for real-time applications. Such applications include embedded systems (programmable thermostats, household appliance controllers), industrial robots, spacecraft, industrial control (see SCADA), and scientific research equipment." (See Wikipedia: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/RTOS.)

In rejecting claim 16, the Examiner pointed to Larson's para. [0072] for teaching different types of RTOS. The applicant respectfully disagrees. Para. [0072] of Larson states:

> [0072] Embodiments of the present invention provide numerous advantages over prior cPCI systems. As mentioned above in the Background of the Invention section, existing cPCI systems use general purpose host processor cards to run a customer's operating system and software, as well as to provide management functionality. In contrast, server system 100 integrates all of the manageability of system 100 onto a single server management card 300E. By doing so, a less expensive processor 502 can be used, and the overall costs to the customer are reduced. In addition, by partitioning the management functionality away from a host processor card 300A, the features of SMC 300E can be upgraded and improved upon with no direct impact to any customer's host processor card 300A. SMC 300E can be flash upgraded without halting any hardware, software, or applications. The functionality of SMC 300E is independent of the operating systems of any host processor card 300A, thus allowing for a truly multi-OS environment.

This paragraph discusses the division of the functions of running "a customer's operation system and software" and the management functions. It states that by moving the management

functions to the single server management card 300E, the host processor cards 300A does not need to perform these management functions. As a result, any upgrating of the SMC 300E will not directly impact the customers' host processor card 300A. In this sense, the SMC 300E is independent of the OS of the host processor card 300A, allowing multi-OS environment. From this description, it is clear that the OS of the host processor card 300A discussed in this paragraph is the OS of a host computer system, rather than an RTOS.

Likewise, Brunner and Mihm do not teach or suggest an RTOS either. Accordingly, claim 16 is patentable over Larson in view of Burnner, and claim 17 is patentable over Larson and Burnner further in view of Mihm.

Claims 22-23, 38, 40 and 44 were rejected as being obvious over Larson and further in view of Srinivasan (US 2004/0148385). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding claim 22, this claim requires "a plurality of programmable-configured message processing units which concurrently multi-process the IPMI messages to enable the advanced IPMI system for configurable execution performance, by way of each message processing unit looking up the corresponding message service module of the message sheet according to each IPMI message and initiating the execution procedure of the message service module for executing the IPMI message." The Examiner argued that the plurality of I^2C controllers 548A-H (Fig. 5) are the claimed "plurality of programmable-configured message processing units." The Examiner cites Larson paras. [0059]-[0060] to support his argument. The applicant respectfully disagrees. Larson paras. [0059]-[0060] does not describe the I^2C controllers 548A-H. Rather, the function of the I^2C controllers 548A-H and the I^2C buses 554A-H is described in Larcon's paras. [0042] - [0048]. According to this description, the server system 100 includes eight I^2C busses 554A-H, and eight I^2C controllers 548A-H for the I^2C busses. The function of the I^2C busses is described as:

> [0043] The IPMB I^2C buses 554A, 554C, and 554E implement the intelligent platform management interface (IPMI) specification. The IPMI specification is a standard defining an abstracted interface to platform management hardware. IPMI is layered over the standard I^2C protocol. SMC 300E uses one or more of the IPMB I.sup.2C buses 554A, 554C, and 554E to retrieve static data from each of the host processor cards 300A and hard disk cards 300B. The static data includes identification information for identifying each of the cards 300A and 300B. ... [0044] SMC 300E also uses one or more of the IPMB I.sup.2C buses 554A, 554C, and 554E, to retrieve dynamic environmental information from each of the host processor cards 300A and hard disk cards 300B.

> In one embodiment, this dynamic information is held in a second EEPROM 302B (shown in FIG. 3) on each of the cards 300A and 300B. In one form of the invention, the dynamic board data includes card temperature and voltage measurements. In one embodiment, SMC 300E can write information to the EEPROMs 302A and 302B on cards 300. …

Thus, the I^2C buses are used to retrieve information; the I^2C controllers 548A-H are merely controllers of the I^2C buses; there is no description or suggestion in Larson about the I^2C controllers 548A-H performing the claimed function of "concurrently multi-process the IPMI messages to enable the advanced IPMI system for configurable execution performance". In particular, there is no description or suggestion that the I^2C controllers 548A-H "looking up the corresponding message service module of the message sheet according to each IPMI message and initiating the execution procedure of the message service module for executing the IPMI message", which is the function of the message processing units recited in claim 22. Therefore, Larson's I^2C controllers 548A-H are not the claimed "plurality of programmable-configured message processing units".

Likewise, Srinivasan also fails to describe or suggest the claimed "plurality of programmable-configured message processing units".

Accordingly, claim 22 and its dependent claim 23 are patentable over Larson in view of Srinivasan.

Claim 38 recites "by a plurality of programmable-configured message processing units, multi-processing concurrently the IPMI messages, each initiating according to each IPMI message a message service module having a default execution procedure". The Examiner argued that Srinivasan para. [0025] teaches this claimed step. The applicant respectfully disagrees. Para. [0025] of Srinivasan states:

> [0025] In one possible implementation of the first embodiment, the Event Monitoring Module 110 monitors software running on the end user computer and also monitors hardware events occurring on the end user computer based on an IPMI (Intelligent Platform Management Interface 112) architecture, which is well known to those of ordinary skill in the computer art. IPMI 112 defines common interfaces to "intelligent" hardware used to monitor a server's physical health characteristics, such as temperature, voltage, fans, power supplies and chassis. The Event Monitoring Module 110 runs as a service on the end user computer that is to be monitored. After the Event Monitoring Module 110 software is installed on the end user computer, and after the end user opens the Event Monitoring Module 110 (e.g., by the end user clicking on an icon on a display of the end user

> computer, or by the end user downloading the software from a particular Internet web site), the end user is then provided with a Graphical User Interface (GUI) on the computer display allows the end user to select hardware events and software services to be monitored and the type of corrective actions (if any) are to be taken.

There is no description in this paragraph about "a plurality of programmable-configured message processing units, multi-processing concurrently the IPMI messages" as claimed. As discussed above, Larson also fails to teach such plurality of programmable-configured message processing units. Accordingly, claim 38 and its dependent claims 40 and 44 are patentable over Larson in view of Srinivasan.

Claims 7-10, 24-26, 39 and 41-42 were rejected as being obvious over Larson and Srinivasan and further in view of Brunner. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7 is amended to recite "multiple message processing units", where each of them "looks up a corresponding message service module of the message sheet according to every IPMI message and initiates the execution procedure of the message service module." The Examiner argued that Larson's paras. [0059] and [0060]. This portion of Larson discusses an SMC 300E and an alarm event manager. There is no teaching or suggestion of multiple message processing units, or that each message processing units looks up the corresponding message service module of the message sheet. Larson and Srinivasan have been discussed in detail above in connection with claims 22 and 38, where the applicant explained why both references fail to teach or suggest multiple message processing units.

Brunner is related to camera systems for tracking objects from an aircraft. It does not teach or suggest the claimed "multiple message processing units".

Accordingly, claim 7 is patentable over Larson and Srinivasan and further in view of Brunner.

Claims 8-10 depend on claim 7; claims 24-26 depend on claim 22; claims 39, 41 and 42 depend on claim 38. These claims are patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons their base claims are patentable.

Claim 27 was rejected as being obvious over Larson in view of Mihm. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 27 requires, inter alia, "a real time operating system (RTOS) management module having multiple specific mapping functions for communicating with different types of RTOS, allowing the advanced IPMI system to function with different RTOS." As discussed in detail

above in connection with claim 16, neither Larson nor Mihm teaches or suggests this claim element. Accordingly, claim 27 is patentable over Larson in view of Mihm.

Claim 43 was rejected as being obvious over Larson and Srinivasan as applied to claim 38, and further in view of Sanghvi (US 2002/0010804).

Claim 43 depends from claim 38. As discussed above, Larson and Srinivasan fail to teach or suggest the element "by a plurality of programmable-configured message processing units, multi-processing concurrently the IPMI messages, each initiating according to each IPMI message a message service module having a default execution procedure" of claim 38. Sanghvi, which relates to method and apparatus for event distribution and event handling in an enterprise, does not cure the deficiency of Larson and Srinivasan. Therefore, claim 43 is patentable over Larson, Srinivasan and Sanghvi.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (213) 625-5076 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response or deficient in fees, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-3531.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 15, 2009

By: /Ying Chen/
Ying Chen
Registration No. 50,193
Attorney for Applicant(s)

255 S. Grand Ave., #215
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Phone: 213-625-5076
Fax: 213-625-0691